

REMARKS

By this Reply, the first paragraph of the Specification is revised as regards correcting details of the Provisional application upon which this application is based.

Second, Claims 1 and 3 are amended in a minor fashion as regards antecedent basis of certain terms. No claims are added or cancelled. Claims 10 and 11 are withdrawn to respond to a restriction requirement.

Upon entry of this Reply, Claims 1 – 9 are pending.

The Examiner's Action

In the Examiner's Action, the Examiner required applicant to restrict prosecution to one of two inventions:

- I. Claims 1-10, drawn to the product of a razor blade holder, classified in Class 206, subclass 350
- II. Claim 11, drawn to a method of “removing storing a razor blade”, classified in class 53, subclass n/a

Additionally, the Examiner contends that the claims are directed to the following patentably distinct species:

- (a) FIGS. 1-4; and
- (b) FIGS. 5-9,

The Examiner contends that the above two species species are patentably independent or distinct as they do not represent obvious variations over each other. The Examiner required Applicant to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant's Attorney elects, without traverse, to prosecute the invention of Group I,
Claims 1-9, and the species of FIGS. 1-4.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles D. Lacina, Reg. No. 28094
Attorney for Applicant
The Weintraub Group, PLC
32000 Northwestern Highway, Suite 240
Farmington Hills, MI 48334
(248) 865 - 9430 - Direct Dial
(248) 865 - 9436 - Facsimile

Date: Fri Nov. 3, 2006